

FILED

'82 JUN -4 A9:48

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

DOCKETED

JUN 7 1982

THE MAGNAVOX COMPANY, a  
Corporation, and  
SANDERS ASSOCIATES, INC., a  
Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

APF ELECTRONICS, INC., ET AL.

Defendants.

Consolidated Civil  
Action Nos.

77 C 3159 ✓

78 C 4951 ✓

78 C 5041 ✓

80 C 4124 ✓

JUDGE GEORGE N. LEIGHTON

DOCKETED

JUN 8 1982

PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO  
MATTEL INTERROGATORY NOS. 3 AND 4

Plaintiffs herewith supplement their previous response  
to Interrogatories 3 and 4 of defendant Mattel, Inc.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3

Does plaintiff contend and/or will plaintiff  
contend at trial that each of the following Mattel "video  
game(s)" infringes any of the claims of the "patent in  
suit"; if so, identify each of such claims:

- a. Armor Battle
- b. Auto Race
- c. Backgammon
- d. Baseball
- e. Basketball
- f. Blackjack
- g. Football
- h. Golf

*[Handwritten signature/initials]*

- i. Hockey
- j. Horse Race
- k. Math Fun
- l. Poker
- m. Roulette
- n. Sea Battle
- o. Skiing
- p. Soccer
- q. Space Battle
- r. Tennis
- s. Word Fun

Plaintiffs contend that the making, using, or selling of the combination of the Mattel Master Component with the following television game cartridges constitutes an act of infringement of the stated claims of the patent in suit:

<u>CARTRIDGE</u>	<u>CLAIMS</u>
Baseball	25, 26, 32, 44, 51, 52, 60, 61, 62
Basketball	25, 26, 32, 45, 51, 52, 60, 61, 62
Football	25, 26, 51, 52, 60
Hockey	25, 26, 32, 45, 51, 52, 60, 61, 62
Soccer	25, 26, 45, 51, 52, 60, 61, 62
Tennis	25, 26, 32, 45, 51, 52, 60, 61, 62

Plaintiffs do not contend in this action that any other of the Mattel "video games" infringe any claim of the "patent in suit."

INTERROGATORY NO. 4

For each of Mattel's "video game(s)" identified in the Answer to Interrogatory No. 3, identify:

- a. All parts of Mattel's "video game(s)" that plaintiff considers to be the hitting symbol.
- b. All parts of Mattel's "video game(s)" that plaintiff considers to be the hit symbol.
- c. Whether plaintiff considers any distinct motion to be imparted to the hit symbol and describe such distinct motion.
- d. Whether or not plaintiff considers there is any coincidence between the hit symbol and hitting symbol.
- e. The occasion and/or event during which there is any coincidence between the hit symbol and the hitting symbol.
- f. The occasion or event during which there is coincidence between the hit symbol and hitting symbol followed by a distinct motion being imparted to the hit symbol.

Tennis- Either player/racquet image is a hitting symbol; the ball image is a hit symbol; a player/racquet image and the ball image are in coincidence when the player/racquet image hits the ball image; and a distinct motion is imparted to the ball image after the occurrence of such coincidence when the ball image moves away from the player/racquet image.

Hockey- The defensive captain control man image is a hitting symbol; the puck image is a hit symbol; the defensive captain control man image and the puck image are in coincidence when the defensive captain control man image intercepts the puck image after a pass or shot by the offensive control man image; and a distinct motion is imparted to the puck image after the occurrence of such coincidence when the puck image moves with or is shot or passed by the former defensive captain control man image that intercepted the puck image.

Soccer- The defensive captain control man image is a hitting symbol; the ball image is a hit symbol; the defensive captain control man image and the ball image are in coincidence when the defensive captain control man image intercepts the ball image after a pass or shot by the offensive control man image; and a distinct motion is imparted to the ball image after the occurrence of such coincidence

when the ball image moves with or is shot or passed by the former defensive captain control man image that intercepted the ball image.


Baseball- The batter/bat image and the control fielder image are hitting symbols; the ball image is a hit symbol; the batter/bat image and the ball image are in coincidence when the batter/bat image hits the ball image and a distinct motion is imparted to the ball image after the occurrence of such coincidence when the ball image moves away from the batter/bat image; the control fielder image and the ball image are in coincidence when the control fielder image catches the ball image and a distinct motion is imparted to the ball image after the occurrence of such coincidence when the control fielder/ball images move together or the ball image is thrown by the control fielder image.

Football- The defensive captain image is a hitting symbol; the ball image is a hit symbol; the defensive captain image and the ball image are in coincidence when the defensive captain image intercepts a pass by the offensive captain image; and a distinct motion is imparted to the ball image after the occurrence of such coincidence when the defensive captain/ball images move together.

Basketball- The defensive captain image is a hitting symbol; the ball image is a hit symbol; the defensive captain image and the ball image are in coincidence when the defensive captain image intercepts a pass or blocks a shot by the offensive control player; and a distinct motion is imparted to the ball image after the occurrence of such a coincidence when the defensive captain/ball images move together.

The foregoing contentions are asserted or stated  
on behalf of The Magnavox Company and Sanders Associates,  
Inc. by:

June 3, 1982

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Theodore W. Anderson". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Theodore W. Anderson  
James T. Williams  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
The Magnavox Company and  
Sanders Associates, Inc.

Neuman, Williams, Anderson & Olson  
77 West Washington Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
(312) 346-1200

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the foregoing PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO MATTEL INTERROGATORY NOS. 3 AND 4 was served by hand delivery of a copy to:

Granger Cook, Jr., Esquire  
Edward D. Manzo, Esquire  
Cook, Wetzel & Egan, Ltd.  
135 South LaSalle Street  
Suite 2606  
Chicago, Illinois 60603

and by mailing copies thereof as first class mail, postage prepaid to the following:

Marshall A. Burmeister, Esq.  
Burmeister, York, Palmatier,  
Hamby & Jones  
135 South LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60603

George H. Gerstman, Esq.  
Pigott, Gerstman & Ellis, Ltd.  
2 North LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Gerald P. Grace, Esq.  
6949 West North Avenue  
Oak Park, Illinois 60302


Avrum H. Dannen, Esq.  
Dannen, Crane, Heyman & Haas  
120 South LaSalle Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Donald L. Welsh, Esq.  
A. Sidney Katz, Esq.  
Roger D. Greer, Esq.  
Fitch, Even, Tabin,  
Flannery & Welsh  
135 South LaSalle Street  
Suite 900  
Chicago, Illinois 60603

Alexandra M. Goddard, Esq.  
Legal Department  
Montgomery Ward  
& Co., Incorporated  
One Montgomery Ward Plaza  
Chicago, Illinois 60671

Harold I. Kaplan, Esq.  
Steven B. Pokotilow, Esq.  
Blum, Kaplan, Friedman,  
Silberman & Beran  
730 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10017

all on this 3rd day of June, 1982.

  
James T. Williams